

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

GIGI JORDAN )  
Plaintiff/Counterclaim- )  
Defendant, )  
v. )  
RAYMOND A. MIRRA, JR., )  
Defendant/Counterclaim- )  
Plaintiff. )  
C.A. No. 1:14-cv-01485-GAM

**THIRD AMENDED SCHEDULING ORDER**

This 28<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2020, following a telephone conference with counsel, the Court having considered the parties' requests to amend certain deadlines set forth in the Second Amended Scheduling Order in this action (Dkt. 259), as amended by this Court's Orders dated May 15, 2019 (Dkt. 325), July 10, 2019 (Dkt. 330) and October 21, 2019 (Dkt. 353), it is hereby

1. The First Amended Scheduling Order dated February 1, 2018, as amended, is further

amended as follows:

a. Paragraph 3(g)(i) is amended to read: “**Expert Reports.** For the party who has the initial burden of proof on the subject matter, the initial Federal Rule 26(a)(2) disclosure of expert testimony is due on or before **August 14, 2020**. The supplemental disclosure to contradict or rebut evidence on the same matter identified by another party is due on or before **November 13, 2020**. No other expert reports will be permitted without either the consent of all parties or leave of the Court. Along with the submissions of the expert reports, the parties shall advise of the dates and times of their experts’ availability for deposition. Any

expert depositions shall be taken no later than **December 11, 2020.**”

- b. The first sentence of paragraph 8 is amended to read: “All case dispositive motions, an opening brief, and affidavits, if any, in support of the motion shall be served and filed on or before **January 15, 2021.**”
2. In all other respects the Second Amended Scheduling Order shall remain unchanged.<sup>1</sup>

BY THE COURT:

/s/Gerald Austin McHugh  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff Jordan’s request to issue additional third-party subpoenas is denied. Plaintiff has long known of gaps in the information previously produced in discovery, and the reasons for such gaps. Plaintiff has had multiple opportunities to pursue the information it now seeks. No credible reason has been advanced for her failure to follow through until this late stage in the litigation.